



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,453	09/08/2003	Elena Mate	1376-0200620	9810

34456 7590 09/05/2008  
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP  
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE  
SUITE 200  
AUSTIN, TX 78730

EXAMINER
----------

WENDMAGEGN, GIRUMSEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/657,453	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MATE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> GIRUMSEW WENDMAGEGN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claim1-2,6,8-9,11-15,18,32-34,37,39-40,42-46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Porter et al (Patent No US 6,337,947).

Regarding claim1, 32, 43, 46, Porter et al(hereinafter Porter) anticipates a method comprising: receiving a video stream at an information handling system at a first rate, wherein the video stream is a broadcast video stream (see figure1 source signal and column3 line 18-20); and editing at least a portion of the video stream at the information handling system to generate an edited video stream, wherein the editing is based on characteristics of the video stream( see figure1 and column3 line 14-26 ) ; and wherein editing occurs in real-time relative to a user's perspective of receiving the video stream (see figure1).

Regarding claim2, Porter anticipates the method of claim1, wherein the characteristics of the video stream include information within the video stream (see column3 line 14-26; parameters embedded in the signal source).

Regarding claim6, Porter anticipates the method of Claim1, wherein the characteristics of the video stream include information from a user action that modified the video stream (see column5 line4-9).

Regarding claim8, 33, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 1, wherein the editing includes applying a special effect to the video stream (see column2 line 31-39).

Regarding claim9, 34, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 8, wherein the special effect includes one or more of removing a logo, implementing a page turning special effect, implementing a fading effect, removing noise, selection of noise filtering, and selection of quality filtering (see column2 line 31-39).

Regarding claim11, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 1, further comprising: displaying the video stream in real time relative to a user's perspective of receiving the video stream (see column2 line 27-34).

Regarding claim12, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 1, further comprising: displaying the edited video stream in real time relative to a user's perspective of receiving the video stream (see column2 line 27-34).

Regarding claim13, 39, Porter anticipates the method of claim1, wherein editing comprises modifying the video stream based on selected editing options (see figure3 step 74 and 78 specifically).

Regarding claim14, 40, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 13, further comprising: determining the selected editing options based upon user input (see column5 line4-9).

Regarding claim15, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 14, wherein determining the selected editing options based upon user input comprises the user selecting one or more editing options from a plurality of predefined editing options (see column4 line63- column5 line14).

Regarding claim18, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 13, wherein the editing further comprises: determining, by the information handling system, a characteristic of the video stream (see figure3 step 72 and 74); and selecting predefined editing information based on the characteristic (see figure3 step 72, 74 and 78).

Regarding claim37, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 32, wherein the utilizing comprises: displaying the edited video stream (see figure1 display 16, column2 line 64-column3 line 13).

Regarding claim42, Porter anticipates the method of Claim 39, wherein the editing further comprises: determining a characteristic of the video stream; and selecting the selected editing options based on the characteristic (see figure1 and column3 line 14-26)

Regarding claim44, Porter anticipates the editing system of Claim 43, further comprising: a user interface configured to receive user input (see figure2 element 60); and an edit control module coupled to the user interface (see figure2 element 22), the edit options database (figure2 element 58), and the video graphics module, the edit control module configured to select another set of predefined editing options based on the user input (see figure1 and 2; column2 line20-63).

Regarding claim45, Porter anticipates the editing system of Claim 43, wherein the video stream is a broad cast video stream (see column3 line 18-20) and the video graphics module is configured to edit the video stream in real-time as the video stream is received (see column2 line 24-31).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 3-5, 7, 10, 16-17, 19-22, 25-29, 31, 35-36, 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (Patent No US 6,337,947).

Regarding claim 3, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach the information within the video stream is a station logo. However it is old and well known in the art to include station logo within the video stream. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to include station logo within the video stream of Porter because the logo would allow the user to identify the channel easily.

Regarding claim 4, 5, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach the information from other than the video stream is from a television guide database. However it is old and well known in the art to use television guide database for editing purpose.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use television guide-database to get information to use it for editing because the guide is readily available and accessible.

Regarding claim7, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach user action being changing channel. However it is old and well known in the art to edit video based on channel selected. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to edit video based on channel selected because it would make editing much effective.

Regarding claim10, 25, 35-36, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach saving the edited video stream; wherein the saving occurs in real-time relative to the user's perspective of the receiving the video stream. However it is old and well known in the art to save (record/store) edited video stream. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to save the edited video stream in Porter because it would allow the user to watch the video stream later.

Regarding claim16-17, 31, 41, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach selecting editing option based on video stream source. However it is old and well



known in the art to perform different editing based on video source. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to select editing option based on the source because it would make editing apparatus much effective.

Regarding claim19-22, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach editing options based of different characteristics. However it is old and well known in the art editing audio video based on different characteristics of audio video. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to edit audio video based on different characteristics of audio video in Porter because it would make editing different audio video easier.

Regarding claim26, Porter teaches the method of Claim 25, wherein the plurality of predefined editing options comprises special effect options (see column2 line 31-39).

Regarding claim27, Porter teaches the method of Claim 26, wherein the special effect options includes one or more of removing a logo, implementing a page turning special effect, implementing a fading effect, removing noise, selection of noise filtering, and selection of quality filtering (see column2 line 31-39).

Regarding claim28, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach editing option comprising implementing a page turning effect. However it is old and well known to use page turning effect. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use page turning effect in Porter because it would make transition from one scene to next more interesting to the user.

Regarding claim29, Porter teaches the method of claim 25, wherein the plurality of predefined editing options comprises implementing a fading effect (see column2 line 31-39).

**Claim23-24,38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (Patent No US 6,337,947) as applied to Claim1-2,6,8-9,11-15,18,25,32-34,37,39-40,42-46 and claim10, 25-27, 29, 35-36 above, and further in view of Linnartz et al (Patent No 7,336,712).

Regarding claim23, 24, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach modifying a predetermined location of an image of the video stream. However Linnartz et al (hereinafter Linnartz) teaches receiver modifying a predetermined location of an image (removing logo from an image) (see column1 line32-38).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to modify an image as in Linnartz in to Porter because it would allow the

user to replace it with information related to the content (see Linnartz column1 line32-38).

Regarding claim38, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach video stream being streaming video. However it is old and well known in the art to receive streaming video to edit and store. Therefore official notice is taken.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to receive streaming video to edit in Porter system because streaming video is widely used method of delivering video stream.

**Claim30** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter et al (Patent No US 6,337,947) as applied to Claim1-2,6,8-9,11-15,18,25,32-34,37,39-40,42-46 and claim10, 25-27, 29, 35-36 above, and further in view of Matsui et al (Pub No US 2003/0086686).

Regarding claim30, see the teaching of Porter above. Porter does not teach editing option comprises noise removal option. However Matsui et al teaches editing option comprises noise removal option (see Paragraph 0434).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to remove noise as in Matsui in Porter system because it would increase the quality of the content to watch.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, absent unexpected results to the contrary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GIRUMSEW WENDMAGEGN whose telephone number is (571)270-1118. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, M-F, all Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:  
10/657,453  
Art Unit: 2621

Page 12

/Girumsew Wendmagegn/

Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621